

Gravitational Thomas Precession and the Perihelion Advance of Mercury

Harihar Behera^{a*}

^a*Patapur, P.O.-Endal, Jajpur-755023, Orissa, India*

Abstract

Gravitational Thomas Precession (GTP) is the name given to Thomas Precession when the acceleration is caused by a gravitational force field. The GTP gives a negative contribution of $7 \cdot 163$ arcsec/century for the anomalous perihelion advance of Mercury's orbit. This effect seems to be of some concern for the General Relativity.

PACS: 04.80Cc ; 96.30Dz

Keywords : *Gravitational Thomas Precession, Perihelion Advance of Mercury*

*email: harihar@iopb.res.in

1 Introduction

The Thomas precession[1, 2, 3] is purely kinematical in origin [2]. If a component of acceleration ($\vec{a}$) exists perpendicular (to the velocity) $\vec{v}$, for whatever reason, then there is a Thomas Precession, independent of other effects [2]. When the acceleration is caused by a gravitational force field, the corresponding Thomas Precession is reasonably referred to as the Gravitational Thomas Precession (GTP). Given the physics involved in the Thomas Precession, the possibility of the existence of the GTP in planetary motion can not be ruled out in principle. However, the very existence of the GTP in planetary motion and its contribution to the perihelion advance of a planet as shown in this letter seems to be of some concern for the standard general relativistic explanation for the observed anomalous perihelion advance of Mercury [4, 5, 6].

2 The GTP's contribution to the Perihelion Advance

The Thomas Precession frequency $\vec{\omega}_T$ in the non-relativistic limit (i.e., when $v \ll c$) is given by [2, 3]

$$\vec{\omega}_T = \frac{1}{2c^2}(\vec{a} \times \vec{v}), \quad (1)$$

where the symbols have there usual meanings. For a planet (say Mercury) moving around the Sun, the acceleration $\vec{a}$ is predominately caused by the Newtonian gravitational field of the Sun,viz.,

$$\vec{a} = -\frac{GM_\odot}{r^3} \vec{r}, \quad (2)$$

where the symbols have their usual meanings. Thus, from Eqs.(1) and (2) we get the GTP frequency of the planet in question as

$$\vec{\omega}_{gT} = -\frac{GM_\odot}{2c^2 r^3} (\vec{r} \times \vec{v}), \quad (3)$$

where $\vec{v}$ is the velocity of the planet. Now making use of the relation $\vec{v} = \vec{v}_r + \vec{\omega}_o \times \vec{r}$, where $\vec{v}_r$ is the radial velocity and $\vec{\omega}_o$ is the classical orbital frequency of the planet and noting that $(\vec{r} \cdot \vec{\omega}_o) = 0$, Eq.(3) can be reduced to

$$\vec{\omega}_{gT} = -\frac{GM_\odot}{2c^2 r} \vec{\omega}_o, \quad (4)$$

which suggests that the vectors $\vec{\omega}_{gT}$ and $\vec{\omega}_o$ are oppositely directed. The very existence of $\vec{\omega}_{gT}$ imply a modification of $\vec{\omega}_o$ to a new one, viz.,

$$\vec{\omega} = \vec{\omega}_{gT} + \vec{\omega}_o = \left(1 - \frac{GM_\odot}{2c^2 r}\right) \vec{\omega}_o. \quad (5)$$

For a planet moving in an elliptical orbit, we have $r = a(1 - e^2)/(1 + e \cos \theta)$, where a is the semi-major axis and e is the eccentricity of the orbit. Thus, for an elliptical orbit $\vec{\omega}$ is a function of θ . But an average value of ω over one revolution may be obtained as

$$\tilde{\omega} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_{gT} d\theta = \left[1 - \frac{GM_\odot}{2c^2 a(1 - e^2)} \right] \omega_\bullet. \quad (6)$$

The interpretation of Eq.(6) is that the perihelion of the planet in question makes a negative advance (i.e., a retreat) of $\pi GM_\odot / c^2 a (1 - e^2)$ radians in one classical planetary year. Thus, we can speak of a perihelion advance of

$$\delta \dot{\tilde{\omega}}_{gT} = - \frac{\pi GM_\odot}{c^2 a (1 - e^2)} \text{ radians/planetary year} \quad (7)$$

caused by the Gravitational Thomas Precession. In terms of Einstein's expression for the perihelion advance, viz.,

$$\delta \dot{\tilde{\omega}}_E = \frac{6\pi GM_\odot}{c^2 a (1 - e^2)} \text{ radians/planetary year}, \quad (8)$$

Eq.(7) can be re-expressed as

$$\delta \dot{\tilde{\omega}}_{gT} = - \frac{1}{6} \delta \dot{\tilde{\omega}}_E \approx - 7 \cdot 163'' \text{ per century, for Mercury}, \quad (9)$$

since $\delta \dot{\tilde{\omega}}_E = 42 \cdot 98''$ per century - a well known data [4, 5, 6] for Mercury. This is in no way a negligible contribution. Therefore, it should be included in any relativistic explanation for the perihelion advance of Mercury's orbit.

3 Discussion

The Modern observational value of the anomalous perihelion advance of Mercury is at $\delta \dot{\tilde{\omega}} \approx 43''$ per century [6]. For Mercury, General Relativity predicts this phenomenon at

$$\delta \dot{\tilde{\omega}} = \left[42 \cdot 98'' + 1 \cdot 289'' (J_{2\odot}/10^{-5}) \right] \text{ per century}, \quad (10)$$

where $J_{2\odot}$ is the magnitude of the solar quadrupole moment - a definite value of which has still to be determined [4]. It is to be noted that the standard explanation for the perihelion advance of Mercury offered by Eq.(10) does not include the contribution arising out of the GTP discussed in this letter. Eq.(10) taken in conjunction with the the contribution arising out of the GTP given by Eq.(9) is not in agreement with the observed perihelion

advance of Mercury. However , as a remedy for this disagreement one may suggest a value of $J_{2\odot}$ at

$$J_{2\odot} \approx 5 \cdot 56 \times 10^{-5} \quad (11)$$

Unfortunately, such a suggestion is not in agreement with none of the existing observational data on $J_{2\odot}$. For example, Dicke and Goldenberg's [7] optical measurements of the solar oblateness showed $J_{2\odot} \simeq (2 \cdot 5 \pm 0 \cdot 2) \times 10^{-5}$, which is about half the value suggested in Eq.(11). It is to be noted that Dicke and Goldenberg's measured value of $J_{2\odot}$ makes the observations of the perihelion advance of Mercury disagree with the predictions of General Relativity [4]. In 1974, Hill et.al., [8] , by measuring Sun's optical oblateness, obtained $J_{2\odot} \simeq (0 \cdot 1 \pm 0 \cdot 4) \times 10^{-5}$. The values of $J_{2\odot}$ much smaller than the above cited values have also been measured by others (for references see for example [4]). From these considerations, the suggested value of $J_{2\odot}$ in Eq.(11) is unacceptable. In this scenario, the GTP seems to make a point of concern for the standard general relativistic explanation for the observed anomalous perihelion advance of Mercury in particular and other planets in general.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the help received from Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar for using its Library and Computer Centre for this work.

References

- [1] L. T. Thomas, Phil. Mag., 3, 1 (1927).
- [2] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 2nd Ed. (Wiley, New York, 1975).
- [3] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd Ed.(Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi, 1995).
- [4] I. Ciufolini and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation and Inertia* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1995).
- [5] C. M. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics*, 2nd Ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [6] C. M. Will, "The confrontation between General Relativity and Experiment", *Living Rev. Relativity*, 4, (2001), 4. [Online Article] : cited on <11May2001>, <http://www.livingreviews.org/Articles/Volume4/2001-4will/>.

- [7] R. Dicke and H. Goldenberg, The oblateness of the Sun, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* 27, 131-82 (1974).
- [8] H. A. Hill et. al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 33 , 1497-1500 (1974).